<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-21, 24-44, 46-49 and 53-55 are still pending in this application. Reconsideration of the application is earnestly requested.

Claims 1, 12, 21 and 44 have been amended to include an auto-focus mechanism. New dependent claims 56-61 have been added that include the use of "position coordinates." These features are described, for example, at paragraphs 55 and 56 of the instant specification. Claim 32 has been amended to include digital signal processing, which is described at paragraphs 50, 51 and 58-65, for example. No new matter has been added.

The Office action has rejected claims 1-14, 16-21, 32, 34-37, 42-44, 47-49 and 53-55 under §102(b) as being anticipated by *Chim et al.* (*Chim*). Although the Examiner's arguments have been carefully considered, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. The Examiner is requested to review the previous reply for a more detailed explanation of the traversal. What follows below is a summary of arguments based upon the recent advisory action.

<u>The Present Invention</u>

Having a camera that does not need to physically move in order to refocus on a particular object in the field of view is advantageous for a user with a camera that physically cannot move or for a camera that does not have sophisticated panning or tilting capability. Refocusing on an image or on sound is provided.

<u>The Cited Art Distinguished</u>

The advisory action on the continuation sheet points out that paragraph 12 (Applicant believes this is actually paragraph 10) of the specification "explains that scaling and cropping is equivalent to automatically focusing on a particular region of an image without moving a camera." Applicant has examined this paragraph and believes it is devoid of any reference to scaling, cropping, or any mention that automatically focusing is equivalent to anything else. For this reason alone, Applicant believes that the action is mistaken.

The advisory action also states that "Applicant has not provided evidence of record to support these factual allegations." Applicant has only asserted that scaling and cropping, as known in the art, are not the same as focusing. Applicant believes that the Office should take

official notice of the meaning in the art of scaling and cropping, and acknowledge that they are not the same thing as focusing. The meanings of scaling and cropping, as well as focusing, are common knowledge. Although Applicant believes it is not necessary, if the Office asks for evidence of these meanings Applicant will provide such evidence.

Finally, the advisory action quotes *Chim* for the proposition that scaling and cropping are the same thing as focusing. Applicant does not believe the reference shows this equivalence and believes that the Office action has failed to produce any reference that shows automatic focusing. Furthermore, claims 1, 12, 21 and 44 specifically require "an auto-focus mechanism" which is not present in *Chim*.

Claim 49

Claim 49 requires:

> computer program code for processing a media content input into a media content display window based on a user-specified region of interest *without moving said media content capturing device*, wherein the user-specified region of interest is specified by the user by selecting a region within the media content display window. (Emphasis added.)

Thus, the media content input is processed based upon the specified region of interest without moving the media content capturing device. By contrast, *Chim* does not disclose this limitation as explained above. *Chim* either discloses panning and tilting a camera to follow a speaker or using scaling and cropping to improve an image. For at least this reason, it is requested that the rejection of claim 49 be withdrawn.

Claim 32

Claim 32 is a method for processing audio input from numerous microphones. Figures 4G, 4H and 4I illustrate focusing on a particular audio direction without moving a camera or microphones. Paragraph 51 describes that the ability to provide audio directions for sound input is achieved using digital signal processing of the audio inputs from the numerous microphones. Paragraphs 61 and 62 also describe focusing (or targeting) the audio input.

Specifically, claim 32 requires "receiving an indication of a region of interest from a user," and "using digital signal processing to process the audio input to target the audio input towards the region of interest without moving said microphones."

Chim has no disclosure concerning a user selecting a region of interest in order to process audio input, and discloses no techniques for targeting audio input from a particular audio direction without moving microphones. Respectfully, it is noted that the portion cited by the Office action at column 7 only discusses continuously processing the data transmitted by the microphones in order to direct the camera toward the speaker. There is no disclosure of a region of interest being indicated by a user nor targeting the audio input toward that region of interest. For at least these reasons, it is requested that the rejection of claim 32 be withdrawn.

Reconsideration of this application and issuance of a Notice of Allowance at an early date are respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would in any way expedite prosecution, please do not hesitate to telephone the undersigned at (612) 252-3330.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER LAW GROUP LLP

/Jonathan O. Scott/

Jonathan O. Scott
Registration No. 39,364

BEYER LAW GROUP LLP
P.O. Box 1687
Cupertino, CA 95015-1687

Telephone: (612) 252-3330
Facsimile: (612) 825-6304